

R E M A R K S

O N A

P A M P H L E T

E N T I T L E D,

R E A S O N S why the approaching
Treaty of Peace should be debated in Par-
liament, &c.

In a ~~LETTER~~ to the AUTHOR.

*The Grandees of the World, of all Kinds, owe more
of their Elevation to the Littleness of others Minds, than
to the Greatness of their own. Were not prostrate Spirits
their voluntary Pedestals, the Figure they make among
Mankind would not stand so high.*

YOUNG's Conjectures on Orig. Comp. p. 56.

L O N D O N.

Printed for M. COOPER, at the *Globe* in *Pater-noster-row.*
MDCCLX.

СИЯНИЕ

АНО

СИЯНИЕ

СИЯНИЕ

СИЯНИЕ

СИЯНИЕ

СИЯНИЕ

СИЯНИЕ

СИЯНИЕ

СИЯНИЕ



R E M A R K S, &c.

S I R,

HEN I assure you, that I have
w no Objection to the Proposal
which makes the principal Fi-
gure in your Performance, per-
haps it may dispose you more favourably
to give Attention to what I have now the
Honour to offer to your Consideration.
The great Question you have started,
seems too problematical, and, to use a fa-
vourite Expression, “ *to have too great a*
“ *Choice of Difficulties,*” for me to pre-
sume to give an Opinion of; and I shall
therefore leave it to the Wisdom of my
Superiors without entering upon it at all.

B

When

When I assure you further, that I have not heard it even hinted at, or conjectured, who or what you are, it will appear plainly that I cannot possibly have any Prejudice against you ; and you may be more readily inclined to believe what I shall say, when you are convinced that my Dislike is not of the Man, but of the Author.

But you will be apt to ask, perhaps, since I have no Objection to the Method you propose for negotiating the Treaty of Peace—the great and primary End of your Pamphlet—why I should give you or myself the present Trouble ? Have a little Patience, Sir, and you will see. But lest your Curiosity should outstrip it, I will directly tell you thus far, that though I have no Objections to the Matter, yet I have many and very significant ones, to the *Mode* of your Address. Be not surprised, Sir, nor offended ; I will soon explain what I mean. You are a pretty free Writer yourself, and, therefore, if you are consistent, you cannot be offended that others should take a Freedom in writing to you.

You

You must know, Sir, that I am a Man of some Education, am a little advanced in Years, and have been tolerably conversant with Public Affairs all my Life. I know something of the Methods in which the great Busines of the Nation is carried on and conducted ; nor am I totally ignorant of the Power and Influence which is appropriated to the several Departments and public Offices of State. It has therefore been an Object of some Pleasantry to me for these three Years past, to see all Power and Influence whatever, in the Administration, ascribed by the popular Cry to One Man ; who, though we should allow him to be ever so great in his Abilities, —and great it must be owned he is—is yet of a very subordinate Rank in the Administration. I could not help smiling to see the pompous Nonsense of the famous City Orator, with his “ *Keys of Knowledge*,” and his “ *Touchstone of Truth*;” and the Addresses of his own, and other Corporations as profound as his, ascribing all our Transactions in Government to this One Minister, exclusive of all the rest. I was diverted to find the Burden of all our Ballads, Addresses, Pamphlets, and Coffee-house-Oratory, to be the Praises of this

One great Man. All our Councils in the Cabinet, all our Negotiations, all our Operations by Sea and Land, were formed and planned by him alone : nay, if we believe the Mob*, our Successes are owing solely to him, and he even fought all our Battles for us : As though all Wisdom and Power dwelt with him, we have heard of no other Name at Home, to whom our Successes and the Administration of our Government, have been attributed ; and the very Idea of Providence seems to be wholly lost.

Thus as we have had for some Time but one Minister, so of late we seem to have had but one General. As all our Veterans in Politics have been obscur'd by the one, so all our Veterans in the Field, are sunk into Oblivion, or perhaps extinguished†, whilst the great and “ *ever la-*

* I use Mob here in its comprehensive sense, as including the great and little Vulgar, whether assembled in the streets or coffee-houses, in common-councils or common halls, in clubs or in private company, who all make a Noise, which has no foundation in truth or common-sense.

† See the World, V. II. No. 55.

"mented" WOLFE, with his General's Truncheon of Yesterday, as though it was a Conjurer's Wand, has drawn all military Honour within his Circle. Believe me, Sir, I mean not to depreciate his real Merit : But he left the World in good Time ; for I am old enough to remember, that we once had likewise but One Admiral ; and we heard of nothing but him, and his six Ships only. Acting up to our Character as true Englishmen, that is, running from one Extreme into another, and carrying every thing to Excess, all our News-papers, Addresses, and Songs, were continually crammed with his Acclamations. In short, he was idolized to a Degree of Madness ; but having done nothing really to deserve this Profusion of Praise, so without doing any thing also to forfeit the popular Approbation, the poor Man I remember sunk into the most pitiful Contempt.

I might here record a living Instance of an illustrious Personage, to whom our Lives and Properties, and our very Being as a free Nation, are at this Day owing, whose Praises are now forgotten or withheld, without the least Demerit on his Part. But as he is of too great a Rank to be mixed with

with the others, and the Treatment we have given him redounds to our eternal Infamy, I shall say no more.

Though I have made a Digression, Sir, from my Subject, yet an Application may be drawn from it, which has its Uses, of a Nature not very foreign from it ; and which you, and my other Readers, will have Sagacity enough, I suppose, to discover. I will now, Sir, return to the more immediate Purpose of this Letter.

As much as it has been an Object of my Mirth, to see the Ignorance of the Multitude imposed upon by the Craft and Artifice of a few, as though really we had but One Minister, who planned and executed every thing, yet I will freely own to you, that *your Letter* had another Effect upon me, and rais'd my Indignation. Though I cannot make you the same Compliment—awkward as it is—which you do to the Letter-writer you follow*, “ that “ he appears to be well experienced in na-“ tional Affairs, and not unaccustomed to “ handle his Pen,” yet you are certainly a

* The Author of a Letter addressed to Two great Men on the Prospect of Peace.

Gentleman of some Erudition. You have read the History of England it is plain ; you are not a Stranger to our Constitution, and you must know something, one would think, of the Train of public Affairs. It is therefore impossible you should be ignorant of the Impropriety of your Mode of Address. One may laugh at the Folly and Credulity of the Vulgar on this Subject, as a thousand others I suppose have done as well as I have ; but when a Man sets himself up above the Vulgar, and echoes back all their Nonsense and Absurdity, he must have a Design which is not avowed ; the black and malignant Design of Faction.

Had you really been unacquainted with public Affairs — which I believe you will not own yourself to be—yet the least Attention to the Letter on which you found your own, would have taught you better. That Letter, you know, was addressed to Two great Men, whom the Author supposes to have the principal Direction in our Affairs : he is so “ far from wishing to disunite “ and separate their Interests, that he is “ fully persuaded, without their perfect “ Harmony and Union, the great Events “ which have happened under their Ad-“ ministration, will not have those per-
“ manent

“ manent good Consequences, so much to
 “ be wished for : and it is only from their
 “ joint Concurrence, that we can hope for
 “ any prudent, spirited, and national
 “ Measures.”

You seem to me, Sir, I must own, to have a very just Idea of the great Abilities of this Writer ; you confess his Superiority, and hold his Judgment (as I do) in great Esteem. But then, Sir, excuse me if I ask you how it happens, that you did not follow the Example of so distinguished and renowned an Author ? When he had addressed himself to Two great Men, as those who have directed our Councils with unanimity, how came you, Sir, to separate them, and to address yourself to One alone ; and to that One of the two particularly who is very subordinate to the Other ? That Author, Sir, has told us, (and if he had not told it, Common-sense would have informed us) that “ the Rank,
 “ the extensive Influence, and the personal Authority of the noble Lord, have given HIM the Pre-eminence in public Affairs.” It was natural when you was writing in the same Cause (unless you had a private Reason to yourself) to follow the same Mode of Address. Could you believe

believe that a Writer of his consummate Knowledge and Abilities (which you have owned yourself) was not qualified to discern the proper Persons to be addressed to upon such a Subject? You could not believe any such Thing. Or, was you vain enough to prefer your own Judgment to his, on such an Occasion? You dare not say so. Why then—I must repeat it—did you alter the Mode of Address? Why was One Minister singled out by You, as the great Man upon whom our ALL depended, as the Only Man who had Power with our Sovereign or Influence with our Parliament; and why this Man, the least and the lowest of the Two whom the Letter-Writer had addressed before you? As I believe you will not be very ready to give an Anfwer to these Questions, I shall presume to answer them for you; and in the Words of this able Author, the Mode of your Address “proceeded from “a factious Disposition, which I am un-“acquainted with, and detest.”

Have you ever met, Sir, with any Instance in our History of a Secretary of State being the *first* Minister? How came it into your Head then to conceive, that a Secretary of State is the SOLE Minister?

C

An

—An Officer who has no more to do with raising and appropriating the Public Money, than you and I have. Could Mr. Harley, Lord Sunderland, or Mr. Boyle, do you think, in Queen Anne's Time, have conducted the War, without the Lord Treasurer my Lord Godolphin ? Or which do you suppose was the greatest of These in Power and Influence at Home or Abroad ? Could Mr. St. John in the same Reign have concluded the Treaty of Peace, without the Lord Treasurer my Lord Oxford ? Or which of the Two, do you apprehend, was Chief in Council and in the Administration of our Affairs ?

But what need I to have Recourse to these Instances somewhat remote ? Would the Duke of Newcastle himself, do you think, have voluntarily quitted the Post of Secretary of State with a larger Appointment, to accept that of First Commissioner of the Treasury with a less, if it had not increased his Power and Influence ; if it had not made him in fact the First and Chief Minister ? Why then, Sir, do you address yourself to the junior Secretary for the Time being, as the ONLY Person directing the Helm of State, who has ALONE conducted

ducted the War, and who ALONE is to conclude the Peace ?

I am far from endeavouring or desiring to depreciate his Merit with his Countrymen. I freely acknowledge it, and I esteem him for it. But then, Sir, let every Man have his Due. Let him not have All the Praise which we owe for our Successes under GOD, *in Exclusion of his Colleagues*; who have equal Abilities, equal Integrity, and equal Merit with him.

There is One Merit indeed which his Colleagues have to boast of, *in exclusion of our Patriot*, which is this. They have assisted with him at all the Councils which have been productive of our late Successes; they have shared all the Toils and Fatigues of the Cabinet with him; and as though they were as solicitous to conceal as to perform eminent Actions, they have quietly permitted him to take all the Glory to *Himself*, which has been the Fruit of their *common Service*. Let their Enemies read this—if they can—and blush.

How it has happened that his superlative and well-known Modesty has suffered Things to go on thus, with an “ unem—
“ barrassed

" barraffed Countenance," or without ever giving a Check to such unmerited Adulation, I have never been able to discover. I call it unmerited, because it has been appropriated solely to Him, when Others, the Lords of the Cabinet, had an equal Right to it. It seems to me, from all that one has read of the Administration within these three Years, that much the greatest Part of my Countrymen imagined —perhaps, Sir, you are one of that Number—that he either sat in the Cabinet Council by Himself, or else that the other Ministers sat only by Way of Form, to nod their Approbation of what he should dictate. There is no accounting otherwise for that intemperate and boundless Praise, which one hears resounded on every Hand, and confined to Him alone.

But if it does not proceed from this Ignorance, it must proceed from a Cause more deplorable—the Malice of Faction ; which attributes erring Counsels to All, and the Merit of good Counsels only to One. You see, Sir, your Dilemma ; take which Side you please to extricate yourself out of it. The Letter-Writer before you, Sir, had Sense enough to perceive—though the Mob of his Country had

had not—and Impartiality enough to acknowledge, that the great Man you have singled out, is so far from being the *Sole*, that he is not the *First* Minister, and has accordingly addressed him in the second Place ; not because his Colleague is a Peer, but because, as he says, the noble Lord “ has the *Pre-eminence in public Affairs.*”

You have been pleased, Sir, to tell the great Man you address, that “ he has “ banished Corruption, infused Vigor in “ to our Councils, established Unanimity “ in Parliament, and retrieved the Ho-“ nour of the Kingdom ; and that it re-“ mains for him to restore an entire Con-“ fidence between the King and his Par-“ liament.” If you mean to shelter your-
self under this Opinion of his unparalleled Power and Integrity, as a Reason for altering the Mode of Address prescribed by this able Author, it is fit I should shew you that the Opinion is unjust and groundless. You must mean, or you mean nothing, that he has performed these public Services, *exclusive of the rest of the Ministry*—of the other great Man, particularly, who was joined with him in the former

Address

Address — and this is the only Opinion therefore which I have to combat.

It is well known that the noble Duke, who does in fact preside over our Affairs, notwithstanding a barefaced, infamous, and affected neglect of him in our public Praises—which, as the Letter-Writer says, “proceeds from a factious Disposition”—has spent all his Life, and a great Part of a noble Fortune, in the Service of his King and Country. He has always adhered with Constancy and Firmness to the same honest Cause ; and supported *one public consistent Character*, of Fidelity to his Master, and of Integrity to the Commonwealth ; being of *the same Complexion in Parliament throughout every Session*. Will you, Sir, presume to accuse this Minister of any Corruption ? You dare not do it ; for it would be abominably unjust. Would you accuse him of Want of Vigour in our Councils ? Let the Sentiments of the Author you follow silence your Malignity. Hear what he says upon this Head.
 “ The Hour of Vengeance was at last
 “ come ; the Interests of the Kingdom
 “ were attended to by those in Power ;
 “ the infinite Importance of our Ameri-
 “ can Colonies was understood, and a
 “ Resolution

" Resolution taken to have Recourse to
 " Arms : and thus England, which for
 " half a Century had been engaged in
 " every body's Quarrels but its own—be-
 " gan the present War ; a War truly
 " NATIONAL. If there be Merit in
 " this spirited Conduct, tell your Ene-
 " mies, my Lord, that You, and a near
 " Relation of yours (whose Memory al-
 " ways will be respected) had then the
 " chief Direction of public Busineſſ."

It was this spirited Conduct, Sir, and his Grace's extensive Influence without Corruption, which " established Unanimity in our Parliament, and retrieved the Honour of the Kingdom." That Influence in Parliament hath subsisted to this Day ; and if any Thing distinguishes the Superiority of a Minister in the Cabinet we all know it is this Influence. Why then, Sir, let me ask you again, did you so affectedly change the Mode of Address so natural for you to have followed, if you had not had some Views inconsistent with the "*Views of sober Consideration**?" Could you suppose that this great Minister had no Power to " restore a Confidence

* Page 42 of your Letter.

" be-

" between the King and his Parliament," or could you not see that it was restored already ? You must be blind indeed if you did not see it, and abominably partial if you will not own it.

By this inviduous Alteration in the Mode of Address, which could not be accidental, you have in a great Measure defeated your own Purpose ; and instead of throwing the whole Lustre on the great Man whom you address singly, you will rather diminish the Share he would have had, if you had addressed them jointly.

But since I have mentioned the Word Corruption, which, you say, the great Man you address " has banished," and which, I say, the other great Man you ought to have addressed also never practised, you will give me Leave to observe to you, before I quit the Subject, that Corruption may be of several Kinds, equally base and scandalous in a Minister. For Instance, if in Order to secure or win over a Party in Parliament to his Measures, he makes a public Sacrifice of his Truth and Honour, *by the most profligate Flattery of its Leaders*, this is as much Corruption on both Sides, as though Money and Places had been

been given and taken. Whether this
“ Corruption hath been banished” by the
great Man you address, I leave you to an-
swer. I will take upon me to answer for
the great Man you did *not* address, that
it was never exercised or countenanced by
Him.

Having said enough to convince you of the Absurdity, or the Faction of your Mode of Address, and in You all others, whether in City or Country, of the same Sentiments with yourself, I shall now beg Leave to inform you, that One Minister, though not One King, is inconsistent with our Constitution.

You talk a great deal in many Pages of your Letter with a great Shew of Zeal of this same Constitution ; but whether you are well acquainted with it, and your Zeal is according to Knowledge, it is not for me to determine. Our Constitution, Sir, has provided, besides the Parliament which is the great Council of the Nation, an Assistance for our Sovereign in a Privy Council ; a few Members of which, consisting of the principal Officers of State, compose the Cabinet : and in this Cabinet all the private and important Affairs

D. of

of Government are deliberated upon and settled; every Member having an equal Right to make ~~any~~ Proposal, to start any Objection, to form any Doubt, and to defend any Opinion which he has taken upon it.

Not a single Treaty, or Operation by Sea and Land, has been ever made or executed in our Time, without this previous solemn Deliberation. How comes it then to pass, Sir, that You, and a thousand others, more ignorant indeed than you are, should ever be bold enough to suggest, that we had but ONE Minister upon whom our ALL depends? You tell the great Man you address, among many other Strokes of Adulation—though you do not mean, you say, to write his Panegyric—as follows. “ The restoring “ the Dignity of Parliament, the Inde-“ pendence of the Constitution, the Esta-“ blishment of Œconomy, and the Re-“ vival of moral Virtue, are Blessings ex-“ pected at Your Hands. The public “ Hopes rest upon You. SI TU DE-“ SERIS, ACTUM EST.”

Dreadful Situation! Give me Leave, Sir, before I go any further, to condole with

with You and my Countrymen on the melancholly News you tell. At a Time when the signal Successes of our Arms have exalted our Country to the highest Pinnacle of Glory and Reputation, how terrible must it be to reflect, that it is so very precarious as to depend upon a single Life ; and if One Man, whose Constitution is extremely feeble, should be taken from us, our Liberty, and our Property, our Grandeur, and our Virtue, must all be buried with him ! Quis talia fando, Temperet a lachrymis ?

But I believe, Sir, and trust in Providence, a little more perhaps than You do. I confess I trust also, unfashionable as it may be to do so, and daring as it may be thought to say so, in the Abilities and Integrity of the other Lords who compose the Cabinet Council ; who if they did not co-operate with him in every thing, the Secretary, whom You, and the Voice of a few Sycophants, have proclaimed our ONLY Minister, would not be able to do Any thing,

The First Minister of State, according to Common-sense, and as far as a First Minister is admitted by our Constitution,

D 2 is

is the Lord Treasurer, or, which is the same in fact, the First Commissioner of the Treasury; who has the Care and Disposal of the public Money, and the naming to all Employments in the several Departments of the Revenue. This Post is very ably and very uprightly filled, at present, by the noble Duke, whom the Letter-Writer you follow very wisely and very honestly joined with the Secretary in his Address; and whom you very absurdly and very factiously omitted in yours. Had he not been possessed of the supreme Post in which he stands, yet I think his long and faithful Services to the Crown, and to the Publick, intitle him as much to the Notice and Applauses of the latter, as we have seen they have been distinguished and rewarded by the former. The Duke, Sir, was one of the greatest Bulwarks of our Liberty, when the Secretary was in his Cradle; and deeply engaged in the Affairs of State, which he has ever since continued in, whilst the other great Man was training only for a Pair of Colours: having therefore these long Services to plead, as well as his present Possession of the supreme Post in the Nation, surely if one of these was to be distinguished as Sole Minister
tha

that Apellation would be bestowed with most Propriety on the Former.

But I have shewn you, Sir, that One Minister is unknown to our Constitution, and I hope never to see the Time, when so great a Breach will be made in the Constitution, as to have all our Affairs directed—as you suggest they now are—by ONE Minister only.

Permit me to remind you, Sir, that we have such an Officer of State as President of the Council ; and we have a noble Lord now who fills that important Office, whose Education for a Minister, whose extensive Learning, and whose Experience in public Business, give him no inconsiderable Place in the Direction of our Affairs.

Besides this able Veteran, you will give me Leave, Sir, to remind you further, that we have another Minister, distinguished by his superior Knowledge of the Laws and Interests of his Country, and intitled to our Trust and Confidence, by his permanent Adherence to its Rights and Liberties ; who though at present without Employment, yet still retains his
Sea-

Seat and gives his constant Assistance at the Council Board ; and who for twenty Years together held the first Post in the Kingdom, with an Approbation unknown before, and equalled by nothing but the Reputation with which he left it. Need I tell you, Sir, of the Capacity and Integrity of this Minister, and of the Influence which he holds, to make you ashamed of your Suggestion, that there is no Ability nor Virtue in the Administration, but what fills the Head and Heart of CNE SINGLE Member ?

The Chief Commander of our Troops, and the First Director of our naval Forces, who have Places likewise in the Cabinet, it is surely to be supposed, are not without Weight in the Determination of the Councils which direct the public Business; in those Parts of it especially, which relate to our Operations by Sea and Land, which have procured us the Glory that we so much boast of.

Now is it possible, Sir, you can imagine, that all these great Ministers whom I have mentioned—to say nothing of any Others—fit mute and solemn at the Council Board, like so many Quakers at a silent

lent Meeting, till the Spirit moves the junior Secretary, to propose his Plans, to form his Treaties, and to delineate the Map of his Invasions, and then, without any more ado, proclaim their unanimous Content, and so crave his Nunc dimitis.

Having finished my Remonstrance on your Mode of Address, I was going now, Sir, to take my Leave of you ; but on second Thoughts it may be requisite to give you a Word of Advice, for the Sake of the great Man to whom you write ; and for whom I believe I have as much true Esteem and Consideration, as You Yourself have. I dare say I know enough of him to know, that he will think I have done him an essential Piece of Service, by rescuing him out of the Hands of such servile Adulation, as he has been of late surrounded with.

My Advice to you, Sir, is in the first Place, that whenever you address him again, you would make no Encomiums on " those Principles which he urged " and defended in Opposition to Sir Robert Walpole." It is true you have but slightly touched them ; but this Point
is

is too delicate to be touched at all. Because the greater the Applause is which you give to his Conduct in That Opposition, the greater is the Blow you give to his Honour. You cannot be startled to hear this ; for it is too public not to known, and too recent to be forgotten, that in the most painful Remorse for the Conduct you commend, he has often offered Sacrifice, with great Contortions of Body, and strong Emotions of Soul, to the Manes of that Minister in St. Stephen's Chapel. Learn your Mistake then, Sir, and correct it.

My next Advice is, that if ever you presume to write another Letter to him, you will confine yourself within the Bounds of just and decent Praise ; remembering that nothing can hurt him more in the Opinion of the Publick, than his Sycophants appropriating, and Himself accepting, the Applause, as due to Him ALONE, which the Rest of the Administration have a Right to share in.

F I N I S.